

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA

HENRY L. JAMES,)
)
Petitioner,)
)
v.) 1:13CV563
)
KIERAN J. SHANAHAN,)
)
Respondent.)

ORDER AND RECOMMENDATION
OF UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Petitioner, a prisoner of the State of North Carolina, submitted a petition under 28 U.S.C. § 2254 for writ of habeas corpus by a person in state custody. For the following reasons, the Petition cannot be further processed.

1. Petitioner has not used the required § 2254 Forms. Rule 2, R. Gov. § 2254 Cases.
2. Filing fee was not received, nor was an affidavit to proceed *in forma pauperis* submitted and signed by Petitioner.
3. It appears that Petitioner was convicted and sentenced in the Superior Court of Pasquotank County, within the territorial jurisdiction of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina. Petitioner should seek the proper forms from the Clerk of that district and file a habeas petition there. The address for the Clerk is: 310 New Bern Ave., Room 574, Raleigh, NC 27601.
4. Petitioner has not named his custodian as the respondent. Rule 2, Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases, requires that the petition name the state officer having custody of the applicant as respondent. The Court takes judicial notice that a proper respondent for North Carolina state prisoners challenging their North Carolina judgment of conviction is the Secretary of Public Safety. Naming the wrong custodian is a common point of confusion, and the Court assumes that Petitioner wishes to name the proper custodian as respondent.

Accordingly, unless Petitioner objects within eleven days of the issuance of this Order, the Petition is deemed from this point forward to be amended to name Kieran J. Shanahan, who is currently the Secretary of Public Safety, as Respondent.

Because of these pleading failures, the Petition should be filed and then dismissed, without prejudice to Petitioner filing a new petition on the proper habeas corpus forms with the \$5.00 filing fee, or a completed application to proceed *in forma pauperis*, and otherwise correcting the defects noted. The Court has no authority to toll the statute of limitation, therefore it continues to run, and Petitioner must act quickly if he wishes to pursue this petition. See Spencer v. Sutton, 239 F.3d 626 (4th Cir. 2001).

In forma pauperis status will be granted for the sole purpose of entering this Order and Recommendation.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that *in forma pauperis* status is granted for the sole purpose of entering this Order and Recommendation.

IT IS RECOMMENDED that this action be filed, but then dismissed *sua sponte* without prejudice to Petitioner filing a new petition, in the proper district, which corrects the defects of the current Petition.

This, the 25th day of July, 2013.

/s/ L. Patrick Auld
L. Patrick Auld
United States Magistrate Judge